## HP Turbine Dens Operating Options and Econo

|                              |  | gas            |                                       |                           |                  |              | *******  |
|------------------------------|--|----------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|--------------|----------|
|                              |  | Unit Operation |                                       |                           | Econ             | omics        |          |
|                              |  |                | Station Net                           | Station Fuel              |                  |              |          |
|                              |  | Station Max    | Heat Rate                             | Consumption               | Total Capital    | Benefit Per  | Pa       |
| Option                       | Description  | Gross Load     | (BTU/KWH)                             | (Tons/Year)               | Cost             | Year         | Perio    |
|                              |  |                |                                       |                           |                  |              | Ī        |
|                              |  |                |                                       |                           |                  |              |          |
|                              |  | 4750 4 844     | 0500                                  | E 000 040                 |                  |              |          |
| 4                            | Current Operation  | 1750 MW        | 9500                                  | 5,268,249                 | NA NA            | NA NA        |          |
| 1                            | Maintain the same historical maximum load                    | 1              |                                       |                           |                  |              |          |
|                              | with improved heat rate.                                     |                |                                       |                           |                  |              | 1        |
|                              |  |                |                                       |                           |                  |              |          |
|                              |  | Same           | -214                                  | -118,536                  | \$9,400,000      | \$4,267,282  |          |
| 2                            | Maintain the same historical steam flow and                  |                |                                       |                           |                  |              |          |
|                              | increase turbine/generator output. (Note 6)                  | 1 7            |                                       |                           |                  |              | 1        |
|                              |  |                | 1 47                                  | \\                        |                  |              |          |
|                              |  | <b>L</b> }     | ľ                                     |                           |                  |              |          |
|                              |  | 40 MW          | -214                                  | Same                      | \$9,600,000      | \$15,137,280 |          |
| 3                            | Install additional plant improvements to                     |                |                                       |                           |                  |              |          |
|                              | increase boiler and other systems capacity.                  |                |                                       |                           |                  |              |          |
|                              | Install moderate NOx reduction equipment                     |                |                                       |                           |                  |              |          |
|                              | (Note 7).  | 100 MW         | -214                                  | 310,224                   | \$36,400,000     | \$35,784,705 |          |
|                              |  |                |                                       | 1                         | ****             | 3            |          |
| tem                          | General Assumptions  | 24.            |                                       | Analysis fo               | or Option 1      |              |          |
|                              | Present Value Annuity Factor (P/A, 6.35 %, 20                |                |                                       | y Increase (guara         | anteed by        | 2.25%        | Benefit  |
| 1                            | years):  | 11.2           | supplier) =                           |                           |                  |              | Hrs.) (0 |
|                              | Hours of equivalent operation/year (8760X 0.9                |                |                                       | Reduction = Pro           | portional to     | 2.25%        | Paybac   |
| 2                            | Cap. Factor):  | 7884           | Turbine Efficience                    |                           | /0500            | 0.1.4        | /Benefi  |
| 0                            | 0 ( - 5 - 5 1 / 6 / 7 )                                      | ¢20            | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |                           |                  | 1            | Benefit  |
| 3                            | Cost of Fuel (\$/Ton):                                       | \$30           | BTU/KWH) =BTU                         | Э/КWН<br>(Heat Rate Reduc | ntion\/Ctotion   | 118,536      | Annuity  |
| 4                            | Cost of replacement energy (\$/MWH)                          | 7\$48          | Not Lood (Fauly                       | Hrs)/(Coal BTU/L          | 5001)(Station    | 110,530      |          |
|                              | Avoided maintenance cost for the station                     |                | Lbs/Ton) = (Tons                      | i iis)/(Coai DTO/L        | .0)(2000         |              |          |
| 5                            | (Note 1):  | \$5,304,000    | (101)                                 | ?)                        |                  |              |          |
|                              |  |                | Benefit per Year                      | = (Reduced Fuel           | (Cost of Fuel) = | \$4,267,282  | Benefit  |
| 6                            | High pressure turbine section retrofit:                      | \$9,400,000    |                                       | ,                         | , ,              |              | Hrs.) (0 |
| eggenerate PMM-Management pa | Cost of additional plant improvements                        |                | Payback Period                        | = (Capital Costs -        | Avoided Costs)   |              | Cost/Ye  |
| 7                            | (Note 2):  | \$12,000,000   | /Benefit per Year                     | = Years                   |                  |              |          |
|                              | Cost of moderate NOx control equipment                       |                |                                       | tatio = (Benefit pe       |                  | 11.67        | Paybac   |
| 88                           | (SNCR):  | \$15,000,000   | Ahnuity Factor)/(                     | Capital Costs - A         | voided Costs) =  |              | Costs)   |
| 9                            | Operating cost per year for SNCR (Note 4):                   | \$2.0E0.40E    |                                       |                           |                  | 12           | Benefit  |
| J                            | Operating cost per year for Sivok (Note 4):                  | \$2,058,495    |                                       |                           |                  |              | Annuity  |
| 10                           | Cool (PTI I/I P)   | 44 000         |                                       |                           |                  |              | Increas  |
| 10                           | Coal (BTU/LB)<br>Urea (SNCR Reagent) Utilization per Ton NOx | 11,800         | \                                     |                           |                  |              | Rate)(li |
| 11                           | removed (Tons)   | 1              |                                       |                           |                  |              | BTU/Lb   |
|                              |  |                |                                       |                           |                  | Ţ            |          |
| 12                           | Cost of Urea per Ton (Note 3)                                | \$300          |                                       |                           |                  |              |          |



## HP Turbine Dense Pack Modifications Operating Options and Economic and Environmental Analysis

| Unit Operation |  |                                  | Economics        |               |   |                    | Environmer          |                               |  |
|----------------|--|----------------------------------|------------------|---------------|---|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|--|
|                | Station Net  | Station Fuel                     |                  |               |   |                    | NOx                 | SO2 Emissions                 | -  |
| tion Max       | Heat Rate  | Consumption                      | Total Capital    | Benefit Per   | Payback   | Benefit/Cost       | Emissions per       | <b>.</b>                      |  |
| ss Load        | (BTU/KWH)  | (Tons/Year)                      | Cost             | Year          | Period (Years)  | Ratio              | Year (Tons)         | (Tons)                        | Er   |
| 750 1011       | 0500   | T 000 040                        | NIA              | 210           | NA  | NA                 | 20400               | 0004                          | Current I<br>Ibs/MBTI<br>SO2. Bo                 |
| 750 MW         | 9500   | 5,268,249                        | NA               | NA NA         | NA  | NA NA              | 26109               | 2984                          | basis.   |
|                |  |                                  |                  |               |   |                    |                     |                               | Operatin<br>trigger a<br>Preventic<br>(PSD) re   |
| Same           | -214   | -118,536                         | \$9,400,000      | \$4,267,282   | 0.96  | 11.67              | -587                | -67                           | year wou   |
|                |  | $\langle \Rightarrow \rangle$    |                  |               |   |                    | $\langle - \rangle$ | $\langle \rightarrow \rangle$ | Since the not chan mandate difficult to          |
| 40 MW          | -214   | Same                             | \$9,600,000      | \$15,137,280  | 0.28  | 39.46              | Same                | Same                          | year natı  |
|                |  |                                  |                  |               |   |                    |                     |                               | Permitting<br>not be dif<br>0.46 LBS<br>more agg |
| 100 MW         | -214   | 310,224                          | \$36,400,000     | \$35,784,705  | 0.87  | £.89               | -6362               | -680                          | not be ma  |
|                |  |                                  |                  |               |   | 341 15             | 100                 |                               |  |
|                | Turbino Efficienc  | Analysis fo<br>y Increase (guara |                  | 2 250         | Benefit per Year  | Analysis fo        |                     | \$15,137,280                  | Note 1   |
|                | supplier) =  | y morease (guara                 | inteed by        |               | Hrs.) (Cost of Re   |                    |                     | \$10,107,200                  | section  |
|                | Boiler Heat Input  | Reduction = Pro                  | portional to     |               | Payback Period =  |                    |                     | 0.28                          | 0000011  |
|                | Turbine Efficienc  |                                  |                  |               | /Benefit per Year   | = Years            |                     |                               |  |
|                |  | eduction = 2.25%                 | (9500            |               | Benefit to Cost R   |                    |                     | 39.46                         | Note 2 -   |
| \$30           | \$36 BTU/KWH) =BTU/KWH Reduced Fuel = (Heat Rate Reduction)(Station                                  |                                  |                  | .118,536      | Annuity Factor)/(   | Capital Costs - A  | voided Costs) =     |                               | capacity<br>towers,                              |
| \$48           | Net Load)(Equiv.   | .Hrs)/(Coal BTU/L                | .b)(2000         | , , , , , , , |   |                    |                     |                               | tovvers,   |
| \$5,304,000    | Lbs/Ton) = (Tons   | 5)                               |                  |               |   | Analysis fo        | r Option 3          |                               | Note 3 -   |
|                | Benefit per Year   | = (Reduced Fuel                  | (Cost of Fuel) = |               | Benefit per Year  | = (Increased Ger   | eration)( Equiv.    | \$35,784,705                  |  |
| \$9,400,000    |  |                                  |                  |               | Hrs.) (Cost of Re   | placement Energ    | y) - Operating      |                               |  |
| \$12,000,000   | ⊮ayback Period :<br>/Benefit per Year  | = (Capital Costs -<br>r = Years  | Avoided Costs)   | 0.96          | Cost/Year = \$  |                    |                     |                               | Note 4 -   |
|                | Benefit to Cost Ratio = (Benefit per Year)(PV<br>O Ahnuity Factor)/(Capital Costs - Avoided Costs) = |                                  |                  |               | 67 Payback Period = ( Capital Costs - Avoided 0.8  Costs) /Benefit per Year = Years |                    |                     | 0.87                          |  |
| \$2,058,495    |  | ouplier outle 11                 |                  |               | Benefit to Cost R   | atio = (Benefit pe |                     |                               | Note 5 -   |
| \$2,000,490    |  |                                  |                  |               | Annuity Factor)/(c  |                    |                     | 310,224                       | remova   |
| 11,800         |  |                                  |                  |               | Rate)(Increased I   |                    |                     | 310,224                       | wans m   |
|                | \  |                                  |                  |               | BTU/Lb)(2000 Lb   |                    |                     |                               | Note 6   |
| 1              |  | *                                |                  |               |   |                    |                     |                               | and iso  |
| \$300          |  |                                  |                  |               |   |                    |                     |                               |  |
|                | ı  |                                  |                  |               |   | ,                  |                     |                               | Note 7   |
|                |  |                                  |                  |               |   |                    |                     | i                             | Selectiv   |
|                |  |                                  |                  |               |   |                    |                     |                               | such as  |
|                |  |                                  |                  |               |   |                    |                     | Ĺ                             |  |

## ack Modifications and Environmental Analysis

| ERROR SERVICE SERVICE   |  |                               | En               | vironmental   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|-------------------------------|------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
|   |  | NOx                           | SO2 Emissions    |   |  |  |  |  |
| :k  | Benefit/Cost   | Emissions per                 | per Year         | Maria   |  |  |  |  |
| ars)  | Ratio  | Year (Tons)                   | (Tons)           | Environmental Assessment  | Comments   |  |  |  |
|   | NA   | 26109                         | 298 <del>4</del> | Current Emissions limits are 0.5 lbs/MBTU of NOx and 0.15 Lbs/MBTU of SO2. Both on rolling 30 day average basis.  | Current NOx emissions rate is 0.42 lbs/MBTU and SO2 is 0.048 lbs/MBTU  |  |  |  |
| 0.96  | 11.67  | -587                          | -67              | Operating in this manner should not trigger a New Source Review (NSR) or Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) review. Variations from year to year would have to be explained.   | There should be no change in NOx and SO2 emissions rate. Total tons per year reductions are from decreased coal burn.    |  |  |  |
| 0.28  | 39.46  | Same                          |                  | Since the NOx and SO2 emissions should<br>not change, increasing load should not<br>mandate a NSR or PSD review. May be<br>difficult to prove as it varies from year to   | There should be no change in NOx and SO2 emissions rate.   |  |  |  |
| 0.87  | €.89   | ) -6362                       | ~                |   | Assumes NOx emissions will decrease to 0.3<br>Lbs/MBTU and SO2 emissions will decrease to<br>0.035 Lbs/MBTU (See Note 5) |  |  |  |
|   | -  |                               |                  | ica i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i   |  |  |  |  |
| of Reprised =   | Analysis for the control of the cont | eration)( Equiv.  <br>y) = \$ | 1                | Notes  Note 1 - Avoided maintenance cost equals the normal overhaul cost for the turbine HP section plus the avoided outage extension of 3 days to refurbish the HP nozzle block.   |  |  |  |  |
| Year = Years ost Ratio = (Benefit per Year)(PV tor)/(Capital Costs - Avoided Costs) =                       |  |                               |                  | Note 2 - Cost of additional plant improvements are the projects necessary to increase the capacity of all other plant systems to handle the increased load. This includes the cooling towers, main transformer, generator cooling and other systems.              |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis for Option 3  /ear = (Increased Generation)( Equiv. \$35,784,7  of Replacement Energy) - Operating |  |                               |                  | Note 3 - Cost of Urea is based on \$0.75 per gallon for a 50% liquid solution.  |  |  |  |  |
| \$  | ( Capital Costs -  |                               | 0.87             | Note 4 - Operating cost for SNCR includes 1% of the capital cost per year for Maintenance.  |  |  |  |  |
| efit pe   | Year = Years   |                               | 0.07             |   |  |  |  |  |
| ost Ra  | itio = (Benefit per  |                               |                  | Note 5 - SO2 emissions will decrease by installation of a device to increase scrubber   |  |  |  |  |
| :or)/(Capital Costs-Avoided Costs) =<br>uel = (Decreased Heat   |  |                               |                  | removal efficiency. The device eliminates the "sneakage" of flue gas around the module walls thus improving removal efficiency.   |  |  |  |  |
| ised Net Load)(Equiv.Hrs)/(Coal )0 Lbs/Ton) = (Tons)  |  |                               |                  | Note 6 - Capital cost includes an extra \$200,000 for minor modifications to main transformer and isophase duct to handle increased load.   |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |                               |                  | Note 7 - For this economic analysis, moderate NOx reduction technology is assumed to be Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction (SNCR) because it is well proven. Other technologies such as ultra-low NOx burners will be evaluated before the final decision is made. |  |  |  |  |